



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/589,794

08/17/2006

Sven Woop

119835-163886

8682

60172

7590

01/27/2009

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.  
1420 FIFTH, SUITE 3010  
SEATTLE, WA 98101

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/27/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/589,794	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WOOP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PHI HOANG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>17 August 2006</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim prematurely ends with a period (“...during ray tracing from being intersected again by the ray. and wherein the device...”). MPEP 608.01(m) states: “Each claim begins with a capital letter and ends with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations.”

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wrigley (US 5,933,146).

3. Regarding claim 1, Wrigley discloses a device for the photorealistic representation of dynamic, complex, three-dimensional scenes by means of ray-tracing, wherein said device has at least one programmable ray-tracing processor in which are implemented: (Figure 9)

special traversing instructions and/or (Column 10, lines 36-52)

Art Unit: 2628

vector arithmetic instructions and/or (Column 10, lines 8-28)

instructions for establishing ray-tracing acceleration structures and/or

at least one decision unit (mailbox), which prevents objects or triangles that have already been intersected by a ray cast during ray tracing from being intersected again by the ray;

and wherein the device is organized in such manner as to allow a plurality of threads to be processed in parallel and to allow a plurality of threads to automatically be processed synchronously, (Column 7, lines 1-20, it is well known that the task of ray tracing can be split into threads for each parallel processor to process)

and wherein the device is provided with an n-level cache hierarchy and/or virtual memory management and/or a direct link to the main memory (Figure 9, element 70).

4. Regarding claim 2, Wrigley discloses a device for the photorealistic representation of dynamic, complex, three-dimensional scenes by means of ray tracing, wherein said device has at least one special traversal unit, (Column 10, lines 36-52)

at least one list unit,

at least one decision unit (mailbox) which prevents objects or triangles that have already been intersected by a ray cast during ray tracing from being intersected again by the ray,

at least one intersection-computation unit, (Column 6, lines 35-42)

at least one unit for establishing acceleration structures,

at least one transformation unit and/or

at least one unit for solving linear equation systems,

and wherein a plurality of rays or threads may be processed in parallel and a plurality of rays or threads may automatically be processed synchronously and an arbitrary number of dynamic-object levels may be realized in dynamic objects, (Column 7, lines 1-20, it is well known that the task of ray tracing can be split into threads for each parallel processor to process)

and wherein the device is provided with an n-level cache hierarchy and/or virtual memory management and/or a direct link to the main memory (Figure 9, element 70).

5. Regarding claim 3, Wrigley discloses said device has at least one special traversal unit, at least one list unit, at least one decision unit (mailbox) which prevents objects or triangles that have already been intersected by a ray cast during ray tracing from being intersected again by the ray, at least one intersection-computation unit, at least one unit for establishing acceleration structures and at least one ray-tracing processor (Figure 9).

6. Regarding claim 4, Wrigley discloses at least one unit for establishing acceleration structures is realized by means of special hardware or by programmable units or ray-tracing processors, and functionally carries out processes for creating the data structure for the acceleration structure and for deciding whether a triangle or a box overlaps another box, (Column 18, line 64 – column 19, line 32) the at least one unit basing the decision on comparisons of the vertices of the triangle or box with the vertices of the second box and--if no decision is possible--making a conservative decision or, in this case, starting a program on the programmable ray-tracing processor,

Art Unit: 2628

with said program making the exact decision, or an additional, special hardware unit makes the exact decision or the entire computation takes place on the ray-tracing processor (Column 19, lines 33-40).

7. Regarding claim 6, Wrigley discloses the at least one traversal unit or traversal instruction is able not only to traverse along a ray but is also able to traverse a volume, so that all objects within this volume can be processed (Column 9, line 55 – column 10, line 2).

8. Regarding claim 8, Wrigley discloses the function of the at least one traversal unit and the hardware implementation of the traversing instructions are based on the fact that a ray is traversed through an acceleration structure based on the kD-tree technique or the octree technique or the uniform-grid technique or the bounding-volume-hierarchy technique, with simplified geometry data being stored in each acceleration-structure node and being used as soon as the ray cone under consideration passes through the bigger part of the volume belonging to this node (Column 9, line 55 – column 10, line 28).

9. Regarding claim 9, Wrigley discloses a plurality of ray-tracing units operate in parallel on a plurality of chips and/or a plurality of printed circuit boards (Figure 9).

10. Regarding claim 10, Wrigley discloses the described ray-tracing hardware additionally uses a space-dividing data structure in which spatial influences and/or material-modifying parameters are stored, which are evaluated with the already available and/or additional functional units (Column 3, lines 1-9).

Art Unit: 2628

11. Regarding claim 11, Wrigley discloses the ray-tracing hardware processes three-dimensional scenes that are not built up exclusively from triangles but also contain other geometric objects which, where necessary, are transformed into different geometric objects and/or processed directly with additional and/or already available functional units and/or the programmable ray-tracing processor (Column 6, lines 35-42 and figure 5).

12. Regarding claim 12, Wrigley discloses the described ray-tracing hardware processes three-dimensional scenes and computes several, one or no ray-object intersections, sorted or unsorted according to the distance, per ray, where the number of ray-object intersections may be defined as a constant and/or described by additional object parameters (Column 9, lines 9-20 and column 11, lines 27-56).

13. Regarding claim 13, Wrigley discloses the described ray-tracing hardware is able, using additional and/or the already available functional units, to count how often a dynamic and/or geometric object and/or a material description and/or an element and/or a subgroup of the space-description data structure and/or a program and/or a memory cell and/or a memory page was used to compute an image (Column 15, lines 35-49).

14. Regarding claim 14, Wrigley discloses the described ray-tracing hardware is able, using additional or the already-available functional units, to compute space-description data structures for partial or complete three-dimensional scenes, with additional parameters for each dynamic object and/or dynamic sub-object and/or

Art Unit: 2628

geometric object influencing the manner in which the space-description data structure is computed (Column 2, lines 15-35).

15. Regarding claim 16, Wrigley discloses a plurality of ray-tracing units operate in parallel and the required computation data is distributed on the memories of these ray-tracing units and when needed, is downloaded from whichever unit the required data is stored in (Figure 9).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wrigley (US 5,933,146) in view of Lathrop (US 6,597,359 B1).

18. Regarding claim 5, Wrigley discloses all limitations as discussed in claim 3.

Wrigley does not clearly disclose the at least one transformation unit and/or the at least one logic unit for solving linear equation systems is used functionally for primary-ray generation and/or object-space transformation and/or normalized-triangle-space transformation and/or reflection-ray computation and/or transparency-ray computation and or shadow-ray computation and/or the transformation of normals.

Lathrop discloses the at least one transformation unit and/or the at least one



Art Unit: 2628

logic unit for solving linear equation systems is used functionally for primary-ray generation and/or object-space transformation and/or normalized-triangle- space transformation and/or reflection-ray computation and/or transparency-ray computation and or shadow-ray computation and/or the transformation of normals (Column 11, lines 1-35, a transformation is performed by the apparatus and tracing is performed in a new coordinate space)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wrigley to calculate transformations for objects as disclosed by Lathrop because objects to be traced can be placed in different positions or alter its position to a desired coordinate system for tracing.

19. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wrigley (US 5,933,146).

20. Regarding claim 7, Wrigley discloses all limitations as discussed in claim 1.

Wrigley does not clearly disclose the at least one traversal unit or traversal instruction is able not only to traverse along a ray but also along a ray cone or a ray pyramid, so that all objects located within the ray cone or the ray pyramid can be processed from front to back. However, Wrigley discloses traversal with a sphere (Column 9, line 55 – column 10, line 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to traverse a cone or a pyramid because they are known shapes that can be traced similarly to a sphere.

Art Unit: 2628

21. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wrigley (US 5,933,146) in view of Buehler (US 2003/0160788 A1).

22. Regarding claim 15, Wrigley discloses all limitations as discussed in claim 1.

Wrigley does not disclose the described ray-tracing hardware is connected via a shared z buffer and frame buffer with rasterization hardware that is located on the same chip as the ray- tracing hardware or on a separate chip.

Buehler discloses the described ray-tracing hardware is connected via a shared z buffer and frame buffer with rasterization hardware that is located on the same chip as the ray- tracing hardware or on a separate chip (Figure 2 and page 2, paragraphs 0022 - 0025).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wrigley to use buffers and other rasterization hardware as disclosed by Buehler because hardware such as z buffers are well known components used in three dimensional graphics processing because z buffers typically hold depth values for polygons.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHI HOANG whose telephone number is (571)270-3417. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5:00pm EST.

Art Unit: 2628

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xiao Wu can be reached on 571-272-7761. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Phi Hoang/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2628  
January 16, 2009

/XIAO M. WU/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628